

REMARKS

Claims 1-15, and 17-21 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-3, 15-17, and 21 stand rejected, claims 4-14 are objected to, and claims 18-20 have been allowed. By this amendment, claim 1 has been amended and support for this amendment may be found, for example, in FIGs. 8, and 10-17, as well as original claim 16, as examples. Furthermore, objected to claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form to include the elements of original claim 1. Moreover, claim 15 has been amended to include elements of claim 16, which is canceled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-3, 15-17, and 21 in light of the following comments.

Claims 1-3, 15-17, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hengesbach (U.S. Patent No. 4,035,004). Applicant respectfully traverses for the following reasons.

Concerning amended independent claim 1, this claim features a liquid spraying apparatus having, among other things, a “connector means being self-latching in response to connection of the outlet [of a reservoir] to the inlet [of a spray gun].” In contrast none of the embodiments taught by Hengesbach teach a connector or means for connecting that is self-latching in response to a connection of a reservoir to a spray gun inlet. Rather, the embodiments in FIGs. 3-7 of Hengesbach, for example, teach a threaded, screw-on type connector 8 to actually connect a spray gun inlet to a container. It is self-evident that the screw-on connections in these embodiments are not “self-latching” and would not teach or suggest the presently claimed elements of claim 1.

The other embodiment illustrated in FIG. 8 of Hengesbach also teaches a threaded connector part 47 (see also col. 5, ll. 59-62) for attaching the disclosed connector to the spray gun inlet, and a threaded neck 24 for connection to a fitting 36 on the container 37. The connector part 47 engages with a sleeve 40 in a quick disconnect fashion using radially movable detents 42 impinged upon by a cammed annulus 45 that is biased with a spring 46 (See e.g., col. 5, ll. 53-58). As one skilled in the art will appreciate, however, since the cam 44 of annulus 45 allows the detents 42 to move radially outward, the annulus 45 must be manually moved against the spring 46 bias in order to allow the detents 42 to move into the space afforded by the cam 44 to allow connection of part 47 to sleeve 40 (See also, col. 6, ll. 3-5). Thus, this connection is not “self-

latching” as featured in claim 1, but is instead manually latching. Accordingly, Hengesbach does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 1 and the rejection should be withdrawn, accordingly.

With respect to dependent claims 2 and 3, Applicant submits that these claims are further allowable on their merits, and also due to their dependency on independent claim 1.

Concerning amended claim 15, this claim contains features similar to the features discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 15 is believed allowable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons. Additionally, claim 17, which depends from claim 15, is further allowable on its merits, and also due to its dependency on independent claim 1.

Finally, concerning independent claim 21, this claim features, among other things, “a resilient retainer on one of [a] reservoir and spray gun, and an abutment on the other of the reservoir and spray gun, the retainer being engageable with the abutment when an outlet of the reservoir is connected to an inlet of the spray gun to prevent separation of the reservoir and spray gun while permitting rotation of the reservoir relative to the spray gun.” None of the embodiments of Hengesbach teach a retainer having both “a resilient retainer” and an “abutment” useable with a connector system to prevent separation of a reservoir and spray gun. Rather, Hengesbach teaches either screw-type connections or detents engaging with a shoulder 49 of a neck 48 to prevent separation. Accordingly, Hengesbach simply fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 21 and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 4-14, and the amendment made to claim 4 to incorporate original claim 1 is believed to now render these claims allowable. Additionally, claims 18-20 have already been allowed, as kindly indicated by the Examiner.

In conclusion, Applicant asserts that claims 1-15, and 17-21 are allowable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the remarks above and further requests that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

February 15, 2008
Date

Respectfully submitted,

By: Pamela L. Stewart
Pamela L. Stewart, Reg. No.: 45,707
Telephone No.: (651) 733-2059

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833